

RWST, and backup service water platform.

#### *Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed exemption is needed to permit the licensee to restart and operate the plant without being in violation of the Commission's regulations and to obviate the need for extensive modifications. Physical modification of the plant to achieve literal compliance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III.J, would require installation of emergency lighting in an exposed outdoor environment which would require special protective enclosures and extensive maintenance to maintain operability. Since security lighting which meets the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(c)(5) is already installed in these areas and since this security lighting has already been acceptable to justify a similar exemption which was issued on January 7, 1987, application of the regulation in this particular circumstance would not be necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule. The security lighting system achieves the underlying purpose of the rule in that it provides adequate illumination to perform the above-mentioned activities in the outside yard for a period of at least 8 hours, has its own independent emergency generator power source, and is not impacted by fires in other areas of the plant for which Appendix R fires need to be considered.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is to modify the exemption which was previously issued by the NRC on January 7, 1987, to extend the use of security lighting in the outside yard to include the CST, RWST, and backup service water platform. The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the probability or consequences of accidents will not increase, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes

that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the "Final Environmental Statement for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Station Unit No. 3," dated February 1975.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the State of New York regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### *Finding of No Significant Impact*

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated March 15, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC, and at the White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of March 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Daniel G. McDonald,**

*Acting Director Project Directorate I-1  
Division of Reactor Projects—I/II Office of  
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-7696 Filed 3-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

#### **Virginia Electric & Power Co.; North Anna Power Station, Unit No. 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License No. NPF-7, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the North Anna Power Station, Unit No. 2 (NA-2) located in Louisa County, Virginia.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of March 2, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to the extent that a one-time interval extension for the Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) by approximately 16 months from the March 1995 refueling outage to the October 1996 refueling outage would be granted. In addition, the proposed action would exempt the licensee from a portion of Section IV.A that requires a Type A test to be performed following a major modification or replacement of a component which is part of the primary reactor containment boundary.

Specifically, the post-modification exemption is requested from performing a Type A test due to the activities associated with the upcoming NA-2 steam generator replacement.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to defer the Type A tests from the NA-2 March 1995 refueling steam generator replacement outage to the October 1996 refueling outage, thereby saving the cost of performing the test and eliminating the test period from the critical path time of the outage.

##### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed one-time exemptions would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemptions would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee will continue to be required to conduct the Type B and C local leak rate tests which historically have been shown to be the principal means of detecting

containment leakage paths with the Type A tests confirming the Type B and C test results. The planned replacement of the NA-2 steam generators affects only the closed piping system inside containment which includes the main steam lines, the feedwater lines, and the secondary side of the steam generators. The affected area of the primary containment boundary is also part of the pressure boundary of an ASME Class 2 component/piping system and, as such, the replacement of the NA-2 steam generators are subject to the repair and replacement requirements of ASME Section XI. The ASME Section XI surface, volumetric, and system pressure test requirements are more stringent than the Type A testing requirements of Appendix J. The acceptance criteria for ASME Section XI system pressure testing of welded joints is zero leakage and the test pressure for the system pressure test will be in excess of 20 times that of a type A test. In addition, the steam generator replacement activities do not affect the containment structure or the containment liner. The NRC staff considers that these inspections provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary. The NRC staff also notes that the containment is maintained at a subatmospheric pressure which provides a means for continuously monitoring potential containment leakage paths during power operation. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the

proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action.

Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for NA-2.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, the NRC staff consulted with the Virginia State official regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated March 2, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185, and The Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-2498.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of March 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**David B. Matthews,**

*Director Project Directorate II-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-7695 Filed 3-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## **SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

### **Under Review by Office of Management and Budget**

*Acting Agency Clearance Officer:*  
David T. Copenhafer, (202) 272-5407.  
*Upon written request copy available from:* Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, D.C. 20549.

#### **PROPOSED REVISIONS**

Regulation C ..... File No. 270-68.

#### **PROPOSED REVISIONS—Continued**

Form S-1 .....	File No. 270-58.
Form S-2 .....	File No. 270-60.
Form S-3 .....	File No. 270-61.
Form S-11 .....	File No. 270-64.
Form SB-1 .....	File No. 270-374.
Form SB-2 .....	File No. 270-366.
Form F-1 .....	File No. 270-249.
Form F-2 .....	File No. 270-250.
Form F-3 .....	File No. 270-251.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), that the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") has submitted proposed rule revisions for OMB approval. Forms S-1, S-2, S-3, S-11, SB-1, SB-2, F-1, F-2, and F-3 are used to register securities under the Securities Act of 1933 and Regulation C governs the filing of such forms. The staff estimates that if the proposed amendments are adopted, approximately 1,249 respondents would file Form S-1 annually at an estimated 1,257 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 1,569,993 hours; 344 respondents would file Form S-2 annually at an estimated 487 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 167,528 hours; 2,290 respondents would file Form S-3 annually at an estimated 413 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 945,770 hours; 345 respondents would file Form S-11 annually at an estimated 859 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 296,355 hours; 260 respondents would file Form SB-1 annually at an estimated 725 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 188,500 hours; 269 respondents would file Form SB-2 annually at an estimated 893 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 240,217 hours; 15 respondents would file Form F-1 annually at an estimated 1,885 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 28,275 hours; 4 respondents would file Form F-2 annually at an estimated 575 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 2,300 hours; 6 respondents would file Form F-3 annually at an estimated 180 burden hours per response with a total annual burden of 1,080 hours and Regulation C is assigned one burden hour for administrative convenience because the regulation simply prescribes the disclosure that must appear in the above referenced forms and other filings under the federal securities laws.

General comments regarding the estimated burden hours should be directed to the Clearance Officer for the